DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 264 SP 009 173

AUTHOR Cruickshank, Donald R.; And Others
TITLE Perceived Problems of Secondary School Teachers.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Problems; *Problems; *Secondary School Teachers; Surveys; *Teacher Education; Teacher Role; Teachers

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to (a) identify and verify a subset of educationally significant events, (b) analyze the events grossly, (c) suggest how the events could be captured and recorded, and (d) suggest a way by which potentially useful theoretical knowledge could be identified and employed. An ancillary concern was to develop instruments which could be validated for use in further studies. In this study, significantly bothersome and frequently perceived problems of teachers were considered to be educationally significant events. The procedure used to identify and verify these educationally significant events were as follows: (a) descriptions of "raw problems" were solicited from teachers over a 10-day period, (b) the descriptions were synthesized for the purpose of developing a checklist, and (c) the checklist was administered to an independent sample of teachers in order to determine specific problems and problem clusters that were reported as most bothersome and that occurred most frequently. The results suggest two different conclusions. The first is that teacher problems consist largely of role-related strivings which the teacher generally has not previously encountered and for which s/he is unprepared. The second is that the global areas of teacher problems are not unlike global areas of people generally (i.e., there is no dichotomy of general and role-derived needs), but the problems may seem different because being the "teacher" exacerbates particular general human needs or goals, making them more difficult to attain. (PB)

ED106264

PERCEIVED PROBLEMS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS[1]

Donald R. Cruickshank, John J. Kennedy and Betty Myers

The Ohio State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP009 173

Several approaches have been cited which can be employed to determine a curriculum for the education of teachers (2: 73-82). However, the approach taken almost exclusively has been to collect and employ the conventional wisdom of a variety of persons in the business. This "wisdom" usually consists of recollections of and unstated and often unwarranted assumptions about teaching. Historically preservice and inservice teachers have found the resulting curriculum more religious and ceremonial than useful.

Smith (10) among others has advocated a classroom-situation-based curriculum development strategy as an alternative to the ubiquitous practice of employing conventional wisdom. At the heart of Smith's proposal is the need to identify and record classroom events of educational significance since he feels that teachers fail because they have not been exposed to them or at least not in such a way that they have learned to analyze and interpret the situations. Therefore, in order to pursue Smith's strategy, the following questions must be addressed. First, what is an event of educational significance? Second, how can those events best be captured or reproduced? Finally, what theoretical knowledge is available which, if known by teachers, might permit them to act more rationally when the events occur?

The general purpose of the study was to begin to put the Smith curriculum strategy to use. Specifically the study intended (a) to identify and verify a subset of educationally significant events, (b) to analyze the events grossly, (c) to suggest how the events could be captured and recorded, and (d) to suggest a way by which potentially useful theoretical

knowledge could be identified and employed. An ancillary concern was to develop instruments which could be validated for use in further studies.

In this study significantly bothersome and frequent perceived problems of teachers and students were considered to be educationally significant events. Earlier studies (3, 4, 5) support this consideration by providing evidence from three different samples of teachers who reported having classroom problems they perceived to be serious. The purpose of this report however is to summarize that portion of the investigation dealing with the perceived problems of teachers only.

In order to identify and verify these educationally significant events, (a) descriptions of "raw problems" were solicited from teachers over a ten-day period, (b) the descriptions of problems were synthesized for the purpose of developing a checklist, and (c) the checklist entitled the Teacher Problems Check List (TPCL) was administered to an independent sample of teachers for the purpose of determining the specific problems and problem clusters that were reported to be most bothersome and that occurred most frequently.

PROCEDURES

Teacher Samples

As mentioned, two separate samples were involved. The first was constituted for the purpose of obtaining raw day-to-day problems confronted by junior high and high school teachers. From a listing of 30,000 secondary schools who held membership in the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), 81 schools were randomly selected. The 81 schools representing 37 states were informed by mail that they had been selected from a national population of secondary schools

and were being asked to participate in a national study designed to determine the nature of problems concerning teaching and learning. Of the 81 requests, 26 school principals indicated that their faculties were willing to participate. For the part of the study reported here, the 26 schools were then requested to provide a complete list of the names of their teaching faculty from which the investigators subsequently identified a 10 percent random sample of faculty members within each school.

The sample of identified teachers within participating schools was provided with My Biggest Problem Today Inventory forms (MBPTIs), described later. For a ten-day period, teachers were requested to describe in detail on the MBPTI the school-related incident that represented the major problem of each day. Faculties of six of the 26 schools failed to return the MBPTIs, thus the resultant composition of the first sample consisted of 70 teachers representing 20 of the initial 81 schools. The returned and usable 563 MBPTIs served as the basis for the construction of the Teacher Problems Check List which was administered to a second national sample of school faculties. The TPCL is also described later.

Initially the second sample consisted of 53 secondary schools, representing 20 states and the District of Columbia. Again schools were randomly selected from NASSP membership. Letters were forwarded to the principals of the 53 schools asking for the cooperation of their faculties relative to verifying the problems previously reported by teachers in the first sample. Specifically, teachers were requested to complete the TPCLs. Sixteen schools indicated that the faculties were interested in completing the checklist instrument. The Teacher Problems Check List

(TPCL) was distributed to all teachers employed by the 16 participating schools, and a total of 310 usable TPCLs were returned. The 310 usable TPCLs represented 36 percent of the total distributed to teachers.

In sum, the first sampling provided 563 raw problem descriptions from 70 teachers representing 20 schools while the second sample, which consisted of 310 teachers from 16 schools, provided information relative to the bothersomeness and frequency of problems appearing on the TPCL. Needless to say, the size of the resultant samples was somewhat disappointing. The obvious attrition which occurred during both stages of sampling must be considered with respect to the interpretation and generalizability of subsequent findings.

Instrumentation

The instrument administered for the purpose of obtaining raw problem situations, the MBPTI, was used and extensively described in two previous studies (4, 5). Of the critical incident genre, it was employed to collect diary-like reports from teachers by asking them to describe thereon their biggest problem of the day. For each of ten consecutive days, the 70 teachers comprising the first sample described on the MBPTI the incident or concern that presented the greatest difficulty. A typical specimen of a problem situation reported on a given day by a participating teacher follows:

> The biggest problem occurred in biology today. The class had its fifth day of a six lab period exercise on the dissection of a frog. Perhaps half the class is really into this, following their instructions carefully, doing exactly what they are supposed to do, identifying organs, and parts, working effectively, and enjoying it. Unfortunately perhaps a third

> of the class tired of the exercise after the first day, and now tend to spend their time in idle picking, and without constant attention would be spending the period talking, or getting into mischief. The consequence is that I have to spend most of my time with the students who are least capable, and least concerned. This, it appears to me, is a rather serious problem with education today.

As previously mentioned, raw problem situations such as the above were used as the basis for the extraction and listing of specific problems which appeared on the second instrument, the TPCL.

The process of examining the reported raw problem situations, eliminating obvious duplications in reported problems, and synthesizing the problems for the purpose of developing a manageable list of succinctly stated problems for the TPCL was accomplished by two of the three investigators. The task was greatly facilitated by the fact that the principal investigator had previously developed two similar checklist instruments, the Perceived Problems Inventory (3) and the Teacher Problems Inventory (5), both designed for elementary teacher problems. It was of interest to note, however, that problem categories contained on the two previously reported instruments were sufficient to account for or describe all raw problem situations reported by the secondary teachers in the present study. The resultant TPCL contained 105 specific problem situations which teachers in the second sample were requested to consider and indicate both (a) whether from their experience each specific problem was "bothersome" or "not bothersome" and (b) whether in their experience each problem occurred "frequently" or "infrequently". An example of five specific problems that appeared on the TPCL is provided below:

Preface each statement with: "I have a problem . . ."

FREQUENT YES	FREQUENT NO		BOTHERSOME YES	BOTHERSOME NO
		a. Liking my students		
		b. Eliminating inappropriate student behavior		
		c. Being professional in my relationships with colleagues		
		d. Encouraging parental interest in school matters		
		e. Controlling aggressive student behavior		

Thus, for each of the 105 specific problems on the TPCL, teachers in the second sample (N = 310) provided information relative to both the extent to which the problem was perceived to be discomforting and the frequency with which the problem was experienced.

RESULTS

Of initial interest were those specific problems that teachers indicated were most bothersome and occurred most frequently. To identify those problems which were perceived to be most bothersome, the mean proportion ($\bar{P}$ = .35) was then assumed to be a parameter and the proportion of response associated with each of the 105 specific problems was tested to determine if it significantly exceeded the value of the overall mean proportion. That is, a binomial test of the null hypothesis that the proportion of teachers who indicated that the problems perceived to be most bothersome was equal to .35 was conducted at the .01 level of significance (upper tail) for each of the 105 problems. Column 3 "Bothersome" in Table 1 presents the 34 specific problems perceived to be most bothersome according to the established criterion.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 1 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The identification of specific problems which were reported to occur most frequently was accomplished in a similar manner. Specific problems whose proportion of response significantly exceeded ($p < .01$) the overall mean response ($\underline{p} = .23$) are also given in Table 1, Column 4 "Frequent". Twenty-nine specific problems are listed. An examination of Columns 3 and 4, Table 1 also reveals that 21 of the 105 specific problems were simultaneously both bothersome and frequently occurring. Obviously, these problems are of greatest concern to the teacher educator.

A visual examination of data (only partially summarized in Table 1) suggested a positive relationship between the bothersomeness and frequency responses to the 105 items. Phi coefficients were computed for each of the items to determine the correlations between the dichotomous bothersomeness and frequency variables. The phi coefficients ranged from +.04 to +.61 with a mean phi observed to be .31. In addition, when items were ordered on the basis of bothersomeness and frequency, a rank correlation coefficient (rho) of .75 was observed. These results served to confirm the a priori suspicions of these investigators that problems perceived by teachers as bothersome would also tend to be frequently occurring, or vice versa.

To determine the global problematic areas or clusters that were represented by the items on the TPCL, both the bothersomeness and frequency responses provided by participating teachers were subjected separately to a factor analysis.[2] The dichotomous bothersomeness responses and the dichotomous frequency responses of the 310 teachers to the 105 items on the TPCL were first subjected to the principal-axis method of common factor analysis to determine the number of salient common factors that could be meaningfully rotated. To be sure to account for all meaningful factors

in these two sets of data, each of the 105-item correlation matrices was "overfactored" (i.e., 20 factors) initially using modified squared multiple correlations as first estimates of the effective communalities (6: 4-5).

Relative to the initial factoring of bothersomeness responses, a summary of resultant eigenvalues and estimated variance shared is given in the lefthand portion of Table 2. The summary offered by Table 2 was used to judge the number of factors (salient factors) that could be meaningfully rotated. The principal methods used to determine the number of factors to be retained for rotation were Cattell's scree test (1: 206) and an examination of the overfactored initial principal-axis matrix (not shown). To apply Cattell's scree test, the eigenvalue difference column is studied for the purpose of determining where (a) the differences begin to "level off" or (b) a reversal in magnitude of difference occurs. The scree criterion suggested either a seven or nine factor solution for the bothersomeness data with preference for the former since an examination of the initial principal-axis matrix revealed the presence of only two substantial factor loadings associated with the remaining 13 excluded factors--a loading of .346 on factor eight and one of .352 on factor nine. To resolve the choice between these two solutions, both seven and nine factors were subsequently rotated with the result that the seven factor solution lent itself to clearest interpretation. The decision, therefore, was to retain seven factors for rotation.[3]

To achieve greater precision, the 105-item correlation matrix was re-factored using the sum of the squared factor loadings on the seven retained factors as estimates of effective communalities. Re-factored results are displayed in the righthand portion of Table 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Factors emanating from the re-factored solution were then subjected to an oblique promax rotation (8) for the purpose of obtaining meaningful structure. Table 3 presents the specific problems that had a .300 or higher loading on each of the seven bothersomeness factors.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 3 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Upon examination, the seven rotated bothersomeness factors were interpreted and labeled:

Factor I: Efficiency - Wanting to have skills and to accomplish tasks considered essential to learning.

Factor II: Support - Wanting the understanding and sustenance of administrators and other teachers so that I can be efficient and feel professional.

Factor III: Invigoration - Wanting to vitalize my students' interests in learning and improve their achievement.

Factor IV: Control - Wanting to get students to behave as I want them to behave.

Factor V: Inclusion - Wanting to establish and maintain rapport with students, other teachers, and administrators. Being interested in them and having them interested in me.

Factor VI: Nurturance - Wanting to help students who have problems.

Factor VII: Influencing - Wanting to change the perceptions and attitudes of students and their parents toward themselves and education.

With respect to frequency responses, the factor analytic methodology was identical. Subsequent to obtaining the initial overfactored principal-axis matrix, a decision was made to re-factor and rotate seven factors. Attempts were also made to interpret the seven rotated frequency factors.[4] However, interpretation of frequency factors was more difficult, thus seemingly less meaningful, perhaps because teacher frequency responses (as opposed to bothersomeness responses) are to a greater extent influenced by local administrative and social factors which inherently are more heterogeneous in nature. In brief, the seven resultant factors were interpreted as follows:

Factor I: Security - Wanting to feel free from fear and anxiety.

Factor II: Remediation - Wanting to improve life for my students by putting right conditions both inside and outside schools.

Factor III: Invigoration - Wanting to vitalize my students' interests in learning and improve their achievement.

Factor IV: Control - Wanting to get students to behave as I want them to behave.

Factor V: Satisfaction - Wanting to feel good about myself as a teacher.

Factor VI: Support - Wanting the understanding and sustenance of administrators and other teachers so that I can be efficient and feel

professional.

Factor VII: Time - Wanting time to get both professional and personal things accomplished.

The factor analysis, however, only reflected the common clustering of specific items contained on the TPCL. Of greatest concern to these investigators was the identification of broad problematic areas--as opposed to specific problems--which were characterized as bothersome and frequent. To accomplish this, the results of the analysis of specific problems (Table 1) and global problem areas (e.g., Table 3) were combined. The intent was to identify those problem areas (factors) which were characterized by a disordinate number of significantly bothersome specific problems or by a disordinate number of significantly frequent specific problems, or both. A visual examination revealed that with respect to the bothersome factors, Factor III (Invigoration) and Factor IV (Control) possessed the greatest number of significantly bothersome specific problems, ten and nine problems respectively. The examination of frequency factors indicated again that Factor III (Invigoration) was defined by a large number of specific problems (fourteen items) that teachers indicated occurred frequently.

DISCUSSION

It is clear from the results that secondary teachers have and are willing to admit to problems that can be recorded and interpreted on dimensions of bothersomeness and frequency (Table 1). Further the dimensions are amenable to factor analysis which defines seven global areas for each. (Table 3 displays bothersomeness factor information only.) Certain of the global areas, Invigoration and Control for bothersomeness and Invigoration

and Time for frequency, possess a greater proportion and a higher percentage of significant individual problems than the other areas do. In Table 3, for example, it can be noted that all of the bothersome problems (10 of 10) under the factor label Invigoration and all of the problems under the factor label Control are significant problems making these the most powerful factors. Following is the list of the seven bothersome factors followed by the proportion and percentage of significant items appearing on each.

Efficiency	2 of 12	or 17%
Support	2 of 9	or 22%
Invigoration	10 of 10	or 100%
Control	9 of 9	or 100%
Inclusion	0 of 7	or 0%
Nurturance	2 of 8	or 25%
Influencing	1 of 7	or 14%

Likewise the listing below of the seven frequency factors indicate Invigoration and Time to be powerful factors.

Security	0 of 19	or 0%
Remediation	0 of 12	or 0%
Invigoration	13 of 14	or 93%
Control	0 of 9	or 0%
Satisfaction	2 of 8	or 25%
Support	0 of 3	or 0%
Time	3 of 3	or 100%

Generally it can be said that (1) Invigoration is a powerful factor in terms of both the bothersomeness and frequency of the problems which define it, (2) Control is a powerful bothersomeness factor but is not at all

significant in terms of its frequency, i.e., Control problems are bothersome but not frequent, and (3) Time is a powerful frequency factor but is not at all definable or measurable as a bothersomeness factor, i.e., teachers are frequently concerned about time or lack of it but are not especially similarly bothered.

The seven bothersomeness factors accounted for twenty-five or seventy-four percent of the original thirty-four problems listed in Table 1 that were bothersome to many teachers. The nine other problems (twenty-six percent) that many teachers said were bothersome but that are not found in any of the seven factors are listed below. Although these problems do not seem to relate to any of the seven factors, they are significant and important.

11 Providing for individual learning differences

19 Knowing how to differentiate between student learning and psychological problems

39 Teaching too many students or large classes

47 Having my students feel successful in school

48 Overcoming student apathy or outright dislike

50 Monitoring the behavior of students outside the classroom but still in the school area

66 Having students present and on time for all classes, rehearsals, games, etc.

85 Keeping my students away from some things and people which may be a bad influence

101 Having my students value school marks and grades

The seven frequency factors accounted for only seventeen or fifty-nine percent of the twenty-nine problems that occurred frequently for

many teachers. The twelve other problems (forty-one percent) that many teachers said were frequent but that are not found in any of the seven factors are listed below. These are also significant and important problems. Several of them, numbers 11, 39, 50, 66, 101, are the same as bothersome items also unaccounted for by the factors.

11 Providing for individual learning differences

28 Enforcing social mores and folkways such as honesty and respect for teachers

33 Encouraging parental interest in school matters

34 Making my classroom attractive and interesting

39 Teaching too many students or large classes

40 Planning instruction in different ways and for different purposes

44 Completing the work I have planned

50 Monitoring the behavior of students outside the classroom but still in the school area

66 Having students present and on time for all classes, rehearsals, games, etc.

81 Helping students know and accept themselves as they are

91 Enforcing considerate treatment of property

101 Having students value school marks and grades

Since the bothersomeness factors contain a higher proportion of serious problems (problems reported by many teachers) than do the frequency factors, these factors are of greater importance and interest than are the frequency factors.

Two related explanations are offered for the results of the study. First consider that teacher goals come from two sources. One source includes the general human needs both physiological and psychological. The

second source of goals arises when the human takes on the role of teacher and assumes what have been referred to as role-derived, institutional or nomothetic needs. Here the person as teacher is expected and usually expects to model certain kinds of institutional behavior. Given the two sources of teacher goals, how do the bothersomeness and frequency factors relate to them? Most of the bothersomeness factors--the goals of Efficiency, Support, Inclusion, Nurturance, Influencing and to some extent Control--can be related to formulations of general human needs such as Murray's (9). Two, and indeed the most powerful two, Invigoration and Control (in the sense it is defined in the study), are not easily related to general human needs and, in fact, seem to lend support to the notion of role-derived goals. They may create for the teacher a whole new set of strivings which the teacher as a person has had little experience with or preparation for.

Similarly almost all of the frequency factor clusters--the goals of Security, Remediation, Control, Satisfaction, and Support--are accounted for in Murray's list. However Time and again Invigoration are not. These goals appear to be role-related. So the first explanation of teacher problems is that they consist largely of role-related strivings which the teacher generally has not encountered and therefore is less prepared for.

The second explanation of the results, suggested by Wood, is that the global areas of teacher problems are not unlike the global areas of people generally (there is no dichotomy of general and role-derived needs) but that they may seem to be different because being "teacher" exacerbates particular general human needs or goals making them more difficult to attain.[5]

Both explanations suggest that being the teacher either creates new

goals or makes normal goals more difficult to achieve.

Investigations are underway to determine whether the factor structures identified are stable so that the TPCL instrument can be modified and eventually standardized. Beyond replication of the study it would be desirable to conduct (1) studies to determine whether teacher problems differ by subject area and/or level of instruction, (2) studies to measure relationships between amount and kind of teacher problems and teacher effectiveness criteria, (3) studies to measure relationships between amount and kind of teacher problems and such variables as teacher age, experience, sex, education and so forth, (4) studies to measure relationships between amount and kind of teacher problems and teaching style, (5) studies which compare student, teacher, parent, and administrator perceptions of teacher problems, and (6) studies to determine whether different kinds of schools present different problem profiles.

Recall that the purpose of the study was to begin to put Smith's classroom-situation-based curriculum development strategy to work. Assuming that the perceived problems of teachers are educationally significant events, the first and to some extent the second steps of the strategy have been accomplished. Next instances of bothersome and frequent individual problems or global problem areas, especially those of Invigoration and Control, must be recorded as protocols or reproduced as simulations. Subsequently the events/problems ought to be studied by key educators and behavioral scientists so that they can infer potentially useful theoretical knowledge which, if in the possession of teachers, would permit them to act more rationally in similar real-life circumstances. The resultant theoretical knowledge would constitute a new subset of teacher education curriculum to be taught or learned in the context of and in relation to

the problem situations. Thus the theory should be more valid hence more readily learned and applied. Clearly use of perceived teacher problems is a tenable, viable alternative for teacher education curriculum which should not be denied.

REFERENCES

1. Cattell, R. B. "The Meaning and Strategic Use of Factor Analysis," in R. B. Cattell (ed.), Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology. Chicago; Rand McNally, 1966, pp. 174-243.

2. Cruickshank, Donald R. "Conceptualizing a Process for Teacher Education Curriculum Development," Journal of Teacher Education, 1971, 22, pp. 73-82.

3. Cruickshank, Donald R., and Frank W. Broadbent. The Simulation and Analysis of Problems of Beginning Teachers. Final Report Grant No. USOE 22-6000A. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, October 1968.

4. Cruickshank, Donald R., John J. Kennedy, James Leonard and Robert Thurman. Perceived Problems of Teachers in Schools Serving Rural Disadvantaged Populations: A Comparison with Problems Reported by Inner-City Teachers. The NDEA National Institute in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, Occasional Paper/Five. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

5. Cruickshank, Donald R., and James Leonard. The Identification and Analysis of Perceived Problems of Teachers In Inner-City Schools. The NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, Occasional Paper/One. Washington, D. C.: The American

Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

6. Cureton, E. E. A Factor Analysis of Project Talent Tests and Four Other Test Batteries. Interim Report 4 to the U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 3051. Palo Alto: Project Talent, 1968.

7. Cureton, E. E., and R. C. Durfee. Factor Analysis I - Prinax and Factor Analysis II - Promax. Contract No. OE-6-10-065 and PHS Grant No. MH-07274 to the University of Pittsburgh and American Institutes for Research. University of Tennessee Computing Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory Mathematics Division, August 1969.

8. Hendrickson, A. E., and P. O. White. "Promax: A Quick Method for Rotation to Oblique Simple Structure," British Journal of Statistical Psychology, 1964, 17, pp. 65-70.

9. Murray, H. A. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

10. Smith, B. O., and others. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The study received partial support from the following sources: Science Research Associates, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Research Committee of the College of Education, The Ohio State University.

[2]The factor analysis was performed at the Instruction and Research Computer Center of The Ohio State University using programs entitled Factor Analysis I - Prinax and Factor Analysis II - Promax, authored by Edward E. Cureton and Richard C. Durfee at the University of Tennessee.

[3]The investigators are indebted to Dr. Edward E. Cureton, Professor of Psychology at the University of Tennessee, for his assistance with this decision.

[4]Results of the factor analysis of frequency data are available upon request.

[5]Personal correspondence with Dr. Michael T. Wood, Social Change Study Center, Battelle Human Affairs Research Center, Seattle, Washington, November 23, 1973.

To be included with material on p. 6.

TABLE 1. Forty-two Problems from the Teacher Problems Check List Identified as Being Significantly Bothersome or Frequent

Item on TPCL	Problem Statement	Bothersome	Frequent
55	Having every student work up to his ability	.79[a]	.74[b]
91	Enforcing considerate treatment of property	.67	.47
105	Getting my students to enjoy learning for its own sake	.65	.60
48	Overcoming student apathy or outright dislike	.64	.32
41	Getting students to use their leisure time well	.63	.59
50	Monitoring the behavior of students outside the classroom but still in the school area	.61	.41
88	Eliminating inappropriate student behavior	.61	
5	Controlling aggressive student behavior	.60	
97	Removing students who are sources of frustration	.60	
51	Having my students achieve competence in basic skills such as competence in expressing themselves effectively in both writing and speaking	.58	.56
39	Teaching too many students or large classes	.57	.38
1	Maintaining order, quiet or control	.55	
3	Having all my students participate in class	.55	.45
14	Having preparation time	.55	.45
66	Having students present and on time for all classes, rehearsals, games, etc.	.55	.33
27	Maintaining student attention	.54	.29
11	Providing for individual learning differences	.53	.47
67	Having enough free time	.53	.41
28	Enforcing social mores and folkways such as honesty and respect for teachers	.52	.37
29	Creating interest in the topic being taught	.51	.34
19	Knowing how to differentiate between student learning and psychological problems	.49	
46	Changing school pol-		

Item on TPCL	Problem Statement	Bother-some	Fre-quent
	icies and regulations	.49	
47	Having my students feel successful in school.....	.49	.34
20	Helping students improve academically..	.48	.44
26	Guiding my students to manage themselves to do the things to help them succeed in school.....	.48	.40
101	Having my students value school marks and grades.....	.48	.39
103	Telling parents that their children have problems.....	.48	
42	Responding appropriately to improper behavior such as obscenity.....	.47	
90	Overcoming a student's feelings of upset or frustration with himself.....	.47	
13	Soliciting appropriate student behavior	.46	
74	Employing retribution or punishment..	.45	
77	Performing administrative functions such as administering standardized tests, scheduling and doing "paperwork".....	.44	
33	Encouraging parental interest in school matters.....	.42	.35
85	Keeping my students away from some things and people which may be a bad influence...	.42	
59	Extending learning beyond the classroom.		.36
68	Promoting student self-evaluation.....		.35
58	Assessing my students' learning.....		.34
40	Planning instruction in different ways and for different purposes.....		.31
44	Completing the work I have planned.....		.31
34	Making my classroom attractive and interesting.....		.29
81	Helping my students know and accept themselves as they are...		.29
92	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for learning.....		.29

[a]proportion of teachers (N = 310) who indicated that a specific problem was bothersome

[b]proportion of teachers (N = 310) who indicated that a specific problem occurred frequently

To be included with material on p. 9.

TABLE 2. Principal Axis Solution of Bothersomeness Responses Used to Determine the Number of Salient Factors

Factor	Squared Multiple Correlations Used as Estimates of Communalities			Sum of Squared Factor Loadings Subsequently Used as Estimates of Communalities	
	Eigen-Value	Eigenvalue Difference	Percent Variance	Eigen-Value	Percent Variance
1	13.14		39.09	13.09	49.82
		10.05			
2	3.09		48.29	3.04	61.39
		.59			
3	2.50		55.73	2.44	70.68
		.35			
4	2.15		62.13	2.09	78.65
		.21			
5	1.94		67.90	1.89	85.86
		.11			
6	1.83		73.33	1.79	92.66
		.21			
7	1.62		78.14	1.55	98.58
		→ .23			
8	1.39		82.27		
		.13			
9	1.26		86.02		
		.11			
10	1.15		89.45		
		.03			
11	1.12		92.78		
		.07			
12	1.05		95.91		
		.02			
13	1.03		98.98		
		.08			
14	.95		101.81		
		.05			
15	.90		104.48		
		.05			
16	.85		106.99		
		.01			
17	.84		109.47		
		.04			
18	.80		111.85		
		.03			
19	.77		114.15		
		.03			
20	.74		116.35*		

*When the factor matrix is initially overfactored and squared multiple correlations are used for communality estimation, it is common that latter factors account for more than 100 percent of common variance (trace).

To be included with material on p. 9.

TABLE 3. Summary of Resultant Factors for Bothersomeness Data (Asterisks denote items that teachers indicated were most bothersome - see Table 1)

	Factor I: Efficiency	Factor Loading
40	Planning instruction in different ways and for different purposes	.423
73	Organizing my work and materials	.405
92	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for learning	.386
49	Setting objectives for individual courses	.382
71	Keeping up professionally	.366
14*	Having preparation time	.352
44	Completing the work I have planned	.332
60	Using A-V equipment	.329
96	Learning to use alternative methods of instruction	.326
67*	Having enough free time	.311
64	Overcoming anxieties related to being supervised	.303
58	Assessing my students' learning	.303

	Factor II: Support	Factor Loading
80	Avoiding duties inappropriate to my professional role	.495
86	Having cooperation and support from the administration	.469
46*	Changing school policies and regulations	.435
95	Developing and maintaining affiliation with my colleagues	.395
24	Being professional in my relationships with colleagues	.384
62	Having confidence in my colleagues	.354

77*	Performing administrative functions such as administering standardized tests, scheduling and doing "paperwork"	.327
61	Differentiating between tasks of teachers and teacher aides	.312
37	Having cooperation from peers, including student teachers	.311

Factor III: Invigoration

	Item	Factor Loading
51*	Having my students achieve competence in basic skills such as competence in expressing themselves effectively in both writing and speaking	.542
20*	Helping students improve academically	.456
55*	Having every student work up to his ability	.450
27*	Maintaining student attention	.415
26*	Guiding my students to manage themselves to do the things to help them succeed in school	.400
29*	Creating interest in the topic being taught	.353
28*	Enforcing social mores and folkways such as honesty and respect for teachers	.349
105*	Getting my students to enjoy learning for its own sake	.331
41*	Getting students to use their leisure time well	.328
3*	Having all my students participate in class	.302

Factor IV: Control

	Item	Factor Loading
5*	Controlling aggressive student behavior	.529
88*	Eliminating inappropriate student behavior	.501
1*	Maintaining order, quiet or control	.499
97*	Removing students who are sources of frustration	.472
27*	Maintaining student attention	.383

74*	Employing retribution or punishment	.382
42*	Responding appropriately to improper behavior such as obscenity	.355
91*	Enforcing considerate treatment of property	.338
13*	Soliciting appropriate student behavior	.312

Factor V: Inclusion

	Item	Factor Loading
24	Being professional in my relationships with colleagues	.521
7	Developing and maintaining student rapport, affection and respect	.513
16	Feeling successful and important	.459
25	Liking my students	.410
62	Having confidence in my colleagues	.350
18	Enjoying teaching more	.346
8	Knowing subject matter	.317

Factor VI: Nurturance

	Item	Factor Loading
90*	Overcoming a student's feelings of upset or frustration with himself	.556
89	Understanding and helping the atypical child	.506
103*	Telling parents that their children have problems	.394
79	Treating all my students fairly	.386
102	Assisting students who have physical handicaps	.380
69	Being tolerant of student differences	.321
75	Helping a student adjust socially or emotionally	.315
81	Helping my students know and accept themselves as they are	.302

	Factor VII: Influencing	
	Item	Factor Loading
52	Improving conditions so that students can study better at home	.490
33*	Encouraging parental interest in school matters	.461
82	Improving the intellectual quality of my students' homes	.414
22	Holding worthwhile conferences with parents	.394
78	Assisting parents having difficulty with their children	.380
9	Helping parents to understand school policies	.331
81	Helping my students know and accept themselves as they are	.326